



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

7/1  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/530,234	07/06/2000	JOHN D. STEEVES	MBM1200	3942
7590	08/27/2004		EXAMINER	
LISA A HAILE GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH 4365 EXECUTIVE DRIVE SUITE 1600 SAN DIEGO, CA 92121			CHERNYSHEV, OLGA N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1646	
			DATE MAILED: 08/27/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/530,234	STEEVES ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Olga N. Chernyshev	1646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2004.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 46 and 55-64 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 46 and 55-64 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 November 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. Claims 46 and 55-64 are pending in the instant application, as reflected in the amendment filed on July 12, 2004.

Claims 46 and 55-64 are under examination in the instant office action.

2. The Text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Any objection or rejection of record, which is not expressly repeated in this action has been overcome by Applicant's response and withdrawn.

4. Applicant's arguments filed on January 23, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive for the reasons set forth below.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. Claims 46 and 55-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method for promoting repair or regeneration of brainstem-spinal axons in a human subject suffering from spinal cord disruption by direct intraspinal administration of a composition comprising complement-fixing antibodies to GalC and complement proteins, does not reasonably provide enablement for the full scope of the claimed invention. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Claims 46 and 55-64 are drawn to a method for promoting neuron repair or regeneration in a human subject by administration of a therapeutically effective amount

of a composition comprising complement-fixing antibodies to GalC and complement proteins. The instant specification describes the principle of the invention and provides the description of experiments on rats having spinal transection treated with composition comprising serum complement and a complement-fixing antibody administered by direct intraspinal infusion. However, the instant specification fails to provide any guidance on how to practice the claimed method in human subjects suffering from pathological conditions other than spinal cord disruption, or using other routes of administration of the disclosed composition, or practicing the administration of “growth factors and/or neurotrophins”. There is no information regarding regime of administration, such as duration, quantity and ratio of the composition to be administered, as well as total lack of guidance on how to treat other “nervous system dysfunction[s]”, thus, requiring undue experimentation to discover how to make and use the full scope of Applicant’s invention, as currently claimed.

The nature of the invention is the demonstration that rats with experimental spinal cord hemisection lesion and treated with composition comprising serum complement and a complement-fixing antibody administered by direct intraspinal infusion showed transient spinal cord demyelination followed by axonal regeneration (see pages 31-38 of the instant specification, for example). The described findings appear to be novel and, therefore, a skilled practitioner would have to solely rely on the instant disclosure to practice the full scope of the claimed method.

While the skill level in the art is high, the level of predictability is low. One skilled in the art readily appreciates that term “a nervous system dysfunction” is not limited to pathologies associated with axonal disruption within CNS. The instant

Art Unit: 1646

specification, as filed, fails to provide any evidence or sound scientific reasoning to support a conclusion that any nervous system dysfunction could be treated by administration of complement-fixing antibodies, which, as recognized by the art and documented in the instant specification, leads to dangerous and potentially lethal demyelination of neuritis. This is especially true with regard to treatment of Alzheimer's disease and Parkinson's disease, for which no protocol, actual or prophetic, is currently disclosed.

The sole working examples in the specification, as originally filed, pertain to the description of spinal cord injury in rodents. While it is not necessary that Applicant understands or discloses the mechanism by which the invention functions, in this case, in the absence of such an understanding, no extrapolation can be made of the limited results obtained within rat animal model to other conditions in view of the art recognition that nervous system dysfunction is not limited to spinal cord injuries and there appears to be no evidence that spinal cord injury model can be predictive of other nervous system dysfunctions, including Alzheimer's and Parkinson's diseases.

The Declaration of Steeves and Dyer under 37 CFR 1.132 filed on March 11, 2004 provides sufficient support that an animal model of spinal cord injury, in particular a rodent model used in the instant application, is accepted in the art as predictive of the efficacy of therapeutic methods for treatment of similar injuries in humans. However, the Declaration is insufficient to overcome the rejection of the instant claims because it presents no information regarding prediction of effectiveness of the treatment of a human subject suffering from a nervous system dysfunction in general by administration of the disclosed composition using other possible routes of administration, such as oral,

parenteral, intravenous etc., based on data obtained on rats with disrupted spinal cord treated with direct application of composition of antibodies to GalC and complement proteins.

Note that although the claimed method of treatment is not limited to intrathecal administration, with regard to claim breadth, the standard under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, entails the determination of what the claims recite and what the claims mean as a whole. In addition, when analyzing the enablement scope of the claims, the teachings of the specification are to be taken into account because the claims are to be given their broadest reasonable interpretation that is consistent with the specification. As such, the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claimed method is such that administration of a composition comprising complement-fixing antibodies to GalC and complement proteins leads to promoting neuron repair or regeneration in a human subject. One skilled in the art readily recognizes that any method of promoting neuron repair or regeneration is only reasonable and possible for damaged neuronal tissue. Moreover, because administration of complement-fixing antibodies in combination with complement proteins causes itself a demyelination of nervous tissue, one would reasonably believe that administration of such composition to an unaffected individual would lead to harmful and potentially injurious effects, which is opposite to promoting neuron repair and regeneration. Furthermore, the instant specification, as filed, provides no evidence or sound scientific reasoning that would support a conclusion that such neuron repair and regeneration would occur when a human subject suffering from “a nervous system dysfunction” other than spinal cord disruption is treated by administration of the disclosed composition.

The instant specification, as filed, clearly fails to supply the guidance that would be needed by a routine practitioner on how to extrapolate data obtained from experiments on rodent model with surgical spinal transection and exercise the same method in a human subject having a nervous system dysfunction, which by broadest reasonable interpretation would include dysfunction due to trauma, degeneration, cancer, infectious diseases, intoxication and most of psychiatric conditions.

The instant specification does not present any guidance on how to practice the claimed method for routes of administration other than direct intraspinal infusion, which provides immediate contact of the active ingredients and the site of injury. Applicant argues that specific sections of the instant specification describe generation of antibodies for use in a human subject as well as complement proteins. However, the distinguishing property of the instant invention is the disclosure of a process of regeneration of disrupted nervous tissue by applying a composition comprising antibodies to GalC and complement proteins. Therefore, the enablement of the instant invention is established based on this distinguishing property. There is no disagreement that one skilled in the art could readily produce specific antibodies as well as prepare a composition comprising such antibodies and complement proteins. The issue at hand remains, however, that the instant specification, as filed, provides no guidance on regimes of the administration of such compositions using routes of administration different from a direct intrathecal injection. The text on pages 28-30 only provides exemplary typical range of concentrations and a statement that “[t]he exact ratio of antibody to complement will vary depending on the circumstances” and “the particular concentration of antibody administered will vary with the particular dysfunction and its severity” (page 28, lines 12-17 of the instant

specification). Thus, provided only with a general range of concentrations of a composition comprising an antibody and a complement protein, one skilled in the art clearly would have to resort to substantial amount of undue experimentation in order to establish “a therapeutically effective amount of a composition”, as well as regime of administration. In the instant case, taking into consideration that administration of anti-myelin antibodies in combination with complement proteins causes demyelination of nervous tissue, a potentially serious pathological condition, a skilled practitioner needs to know precise protocol in order to practice the claimed invention, and such protocol is not supplied by the instant specification.

Finally, the instant specification, as filed provides no guidance on how to practice the claimed method “further comprising administration of growth factors and/or neurotrophins” (claim 56). A skilled practitioner would have to resort to substantial amount of undue experimentation to determine which growth factors or neurotrophins, or combination thereof, are beneficial for promoting neuron repair, and then to assay for doses and regimes of administration for a particular nervous system dysfunction.

In view of the lack of teachings and unpredictability of the art set forth earlier, and also the total absence of the working examples, the instant specification is not found to be enabling for a method for promoting neuron repair or regeneration in a human subject by administration of a composition comprising complement-fixing antibodies to GalC and complement proteins. It would require undue experimentation and making a substantial inventive contribution for the skilled in the art to practice the full scope of Applicant’s invention, as currently claimed.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 60-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
7. Claims 60 and 62 recite the limitation "neuron dysfunction" in claim 46. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
8. Claim 64 recites the limitation "the disease" in claim 46. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
9. Claims 61 and 63 are indefinite for being dependent from indefinite claims.

***Conclusion***

10. No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olga N. Chernyshev whose telephone number is (571) 272-0870. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brenda G. Brumback can be reached on (571) 272-0961. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Certain papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technology Center 1600 via

the PTO Fax center located in Crystal Mall 1 (CM1). The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). NOTE: If Applicant *does* submit a paper by fax, the original signed copy should be retained by Applicant or Applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (703) 872-9306. If this number is out of service, please call the Group receptionist for an alternative number. Faxed draft or informal communications with the examiner should be directed to (571) 273-0870. Official papers should NOT be faxed to (571) 273-0870.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Olga N. Chernyshev, Ph.D.



OLGA N. CHERNYSHEV, PH.D.  
PATENT EXAMINER